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Description
PSSM at Bretton Woods: MR2018011
- Mandatory Referral associated with a request to construct a Public Safety System Modernization (PSSM) radio communications tower in Potomac at Bretton Woods Golf Course at 15700 River Rd.
- Zone: RC
- Property Size: 280.35 Ac
- Master Plan: 2002 Potomac Subregion

Staff Recommendation: Approval with Comments
Review Basis: Md. Land Use Code Ann. § 20-301
Applicant: Montgomery County Department of Technology Services (DTS)
Filing Date: December 1, 2017

Summary
The Applicant proposes to construct a 230-foot tall communications tower for public safety radio communications. The tower is considered a Public Use (59.3.4.9) under the Zoning Code and not a Telecommunications Facility (59.3.5.2.C). The Public Use category within the Zoning Ordinance does not provide review standards. However, because this use is similar in character to a telecommunications facility, the conditional use review standards for a telecommunications facility were used by staff to provide guidance to inform the review of the project for Planning Board consideration.

Staff recommends approval of the Mandatory Referral with comments to be transmitted to Montgomery County Department of Technology Services.
RECOMMENDATIONS:

Staff recommends approval of the Mandatory Referral with the following comments to be transmitted to Montgomery County Department of General Services:

1. There should be no outdoor storage of equipment or other items.
2. Install a sign not more than two feet square affixed to the equipment compound identifying the owner, operator, and maintenance service provider of the support structure and the emergency telephone number of a contact person.
3. Submit documentation on height and location of the tower to the Department of Permitting Services prior to final inspection of the building permit.
4. Certify that the telecommunications tower is operating within Federal Communications Commission (FCC) standards on an annual basis, in addition, an actual radio frequency (RF) measurement should be provided after the telecommunications tower is installed, and after each co-location on the subject tower.
5. The owner of the tower is responsible for maintaining the tower in a safe condition.
6. Remove the tower and equipment compound within twelve months of cessation of the use of the facility.
7. All proposed landscaping as shown on the Mandatory Referral plan should be implemented within six months of completion of the tower.

Mandatory Referral Review

This proposal for the construction of a new a Public Safety System Modernization (PSSM) radio communications tower requires the Mandatory Referral review process under the Montgomery County Planning Department’s Uniform Standards for Mandatory Referral Review. State law requires all federal, state, and local governments and public utilities to submit proposed projects for a Mandatory Referral review and approval by the Commission. The law requires the Montgomery County Planning Board to review and approve the proposed location, character, grade and extent of any road, park, public way or ground, public (including federal) building or structure, or public utility (whether publicly or privately owned) prior to the project being located, constructed or authorized.
PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Project History

This Mandatory Referral was originally scheduled for Planning Board on March 8, 2018. In response to citizen concerns, and Staff’s advice, the Applicant requested the application be postponed. The postponement was intended to allow the Applicant additional time to analyze alternative sites. After additional community outreach the Applicant requested that the application proceed as originally submitted.

Background

The Public Safety Systems Modernization (PSSM) Program will replace the older communications systems with a new system that supports the County’s public safety agencies and personnel to protect the lives and ensure the safety of the public. The PSSM Program is a multi-department/agency multi-year $110M capital project.

The Montgomery County Department of Technology Services (DTS) under the PSSM program has applied for this Mandatory Referral to construct a radio communications tower on the Bretton Woods Golf Course at 15700 River Road. The applicant states that, “the current system fails to provide adequate radio coverage in several areas in the County” and that the, “new base stations are sited and designed to provide complete and effective coverage according to a ‘95/95’ coverage mandate: 95 percent coverage reliability in 95 percent of the County service area.” The applicant further states that in areas where existing radio coverage is inadequate, “there are significant consequences for emergency response personnel. A lack of radio service can increase response time, the number of personnel required to effectively respond to an emergency situation, and the amount of time it takes to resolve an incident.”

The applicant proposes to build a 230-foot Class III lattice tower with a 10-foot lightning rod (240-foot total height) on the south side of River Road east of Riley’s Lock Road. The facility will be an unmanned public safety radio base station.

Surrounding Neighborhood

The Bretton Woods site lies at the westernmost reach of the Potomac Subregion Master Plan in the Darnestown planning area, at the eastern edge of the Agricultural Reserve, the Seneca Creek State Park and within the Seneca National Register Historic District. The area's character is expressed by contrasting lot patterns and varied scales, with narrow country roads feeding major vehicular routes to create a recognizable suburban to rural transition. The Potomac River, lined on the north by the historic Chesapeake and Ohio Canal (Canal) and tow path, defines the southern boundary of the area. River Road rises more than 100 feet from the Potomac River. The Canal’s system of river-edge locks and their associated structures, richly define the vicinity and the site envelope, as do the abundant natural resources of Seneca Creek State Park, articulated by Seneca Landing and Riley's Lock (No. 24), along with Blockhouse Point Park, bounded by Violette’s Lock (No. 23) on the eastern edge of Bretton Woods and
Pennyfield Lock (No. 22), further down river. Other historic resources in the vicinity include the Seneca store, the Upton Darby House, Seneca Quarry, Seneca Aqueduct, Quarry Master's House, the Overseer's House at Montevideo, and the Seneca Stone School. The subject site, although located within the Seneca National Register Historic District, does not include any historical assets, roadways support substantial traffic loads along River Road, which joins Seneca Road at the site's northeast corner. The majority of the area is zoned Rural Cluster (RC) with pockets of R-200. There are a few single family homes in the northwest corner, northeast corner, and eastern side of the Property. The closest residences to the tower location are approximately 1,000 feet away. Figure 1 shows the overall vicinity of the proposed tower site.

Figure 1: 2015 Aerial Photograph of the Vicinity (Bretton Woods shown in yellow)

Site Description

The Potomac River to the south, Violette's Lock Road to the east, and River Road on the north and northeast form the boundaries of the site. The 280-acre site features terrain that rises from the river, with steep slopes in the northeast quadrant of the site. The site was acquired by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) during the 1960s and Special Exception approval was granted in 1966 for the use and development of the site as a recreational club for IMF members. The Property includes an 18-hole golf course, a swimming pool complex, tennis courts, surface parking, a maintenance building, a golf cart shed and expansion, and a caretaker's house. Figure 2 shows the location of the tower site, and Figure 3 shows a view towards the proposed tower site location from the roadway.
Figure 2: 2015 Aerial of the Subject Property

Figure 3: Existing River Road on Westbound Approach to Proposed Tower Location
Proposed Project

The 230’ Class III lattice tower with a 10’ lightning rod will be a total of 240 feet in height. and located on the south side of River Road east of Riley’s Lock Road. The industry standard red and white strobes will be installed as a beacon on the tower.

The tower will be built to Structure Class III standards, which has a “return period” of 1700 years. This means the observed wind speed is statistically likely to meet or exceed the design wind load only once every 1700 years. According to the applicant, Class III structures are capable of withstanding storms that would otherwise devastate nearby structures, and these structures are frequently among the last structures standing after a catastrophic weather event.

The site layout for the project is shown in Figures 4 and 5. The tower will be contained within a 70’ x 70’ pad site area in the northwest area of the Property. A 12’ x 30’ shelter with an internal generator will be next to the tower.

Figure 4: Site Layout Aerial
Figure 5: Compound Layout

Figure 6 shows the tower configuration and Figures 7 and 8 show the range of service coverage before and after the tower’s completion.
Figure 6: Tower Design
Figure 7: Coverage Map (in green) without Tower

Figure 8: Coverage Map (in green) with Tower
Master Plan Consistency

The Subject Property falls within the Darnestown area of the 2002 Potomac Subregion Master Plan. The Master Plan does not make any specific recommendations for the Property.

The Potomac Master Plan’s Land Use and Zoning Plan includes design principles intended to preserve the Potomac Subregion’s “green and rural character, while creating a pedestrian and bicycle-friendly environment” (p. 33). However, none of the specific design principles apply to the type of project proposed but instead refer to more typical development of streets, neighborhoods, and communities. However, attempts should be made to help preserve the “green and rural character” of the area.

Although not a Conditional Use, the Master Plan’s Special Exception (Conditional Use) Policy includes the following recommendations:

- Limit the impacts of existing special exceptions in established neighborhoods. Increase the scrutiny in reviewing special exception applications for highly visible sites and properties adjacent to the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Historical Park.
- Avoid an excessive concentration of special exceptions along major transportation corridors.
- Sites along these corridors are more vulnerable to over-concentration because they have high visibility. Uses that might diminish safety or reduce capacity of roadways with too many access points or conflicting turn movements should be discouraged.
- Protect the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal National Park, major transportation corridors and residential communities from incompatible design of special exception uses. (p. 35-36)

Although the proposed use is a public use facility and not a Conditional Use, it is similar in character to a telecommunications facility, which is a Conditional Use, and therefore similar guidance should help inform the review of the project. There does not appear to be a concentration of special exceptions/conditional uses along River Road, a major transportation corridor, but it is still important to increase the scrutiny in reviewing this application since the Property is a highly visible site. One guideline provided by the Master Plan is that, “efforts should be made to enhance or augment screening and buffering as viewed from abutting residential areas and major roadways” (p. 36). The Applicant has proposed landscaping around the perimeter fencing to reduce visibility of the base of the tower and mechanical shelter.

Neighborhood Compatibility

The Applicant supplied photos showing the results of a balloon test to determine the visibility of the tower from various vantage points in the area (Attachment D). The tower will be visible from several points. Although the tower will be visible from other locations in the area, the importance of the function of the tower, in staff’s opinion, outweighs any affected views. Given the importance of the facility and the need to provide coverage for emergency services in this part of the County, Staff does not find undue incompatibility with the neighborhood.
Historic Preservation and Rustic Roads

Historic Preservation (HP) staff note that the proposed tower is within the Seneca Historic District, comprised of 3,850 acres of federal, state, and county parkland and farmland as well as a number of historic houses. In addition, there are a number of resources listed in the Historic Preservation Master Plan or Locational Atlas that are within the viewshed of the proposed tower. If the project received any federal funding, the proposal would be subject to review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects on historic properties. Absent a review under Section 106, Historic Preservation staff recommends that the proposed tower be painted a neutral color to mitigate adverse effects to the surrounding historic sites.

The Maryland Historical Trust noted as part of the submittal that the site is located within the National Register-listed Seneca Historic District (M: 17-63). Although this portion of the historic district has been altered, the Seneca Historic District overall appears to retain integrity. No effect determinations are applied when the undertaking does not occur on a historic property or when the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) concurs that the historic property has been altered or deteriorated to such a degree as it would no longer retain integrity and therefore no longer be eligible for listing in the National Register. As the historic property being directly affected by this undertaking is the Seneca Historic District, the no effect determination for the Direct Effects is inappropriate and should be changed to no adverse effect.

Zoning

The Subject Property is in the RC zone under the Montgomery County Zoning Ordinance (Chapter 59) (the “Zoning Code”). The RC zone is considered a rural residential zone.

The proposed use under the Zoning Code is “Public Use (Except Utilities),” covered by Section 3.4.9 of the Code. **A Public Use is a permitted use in all zones.** According to the Zoning Code:

*Public Use (Except Utilities) means a publicly-owned or publicly operated use. Public Use (Except Utilities) includes County office buildings, maintenance facilities, public schools and parks, post office, State and Federal buildings. Public Use (Except Utilities) does not include a Public Utility Structure (see Section 3.6.7.E, Public Utility Structure).*

According to Section 3.6.7.E of the Zoning Code:

*Public Utility Structure means a utility structure other than transmission lines or pipelines. Public Utility Structure includes structures for the occupancy, use, support, or housing of switching equipment, regulators, stationary transformers, and other such devices for supplying electric service or other public utilities.*

Section 3.4.9 does not provide review standards for a public utility structure. Although the proposed use is a public use and not a conditional use, it is similar in character to a telecommunications facility, which is a conditional use, and therefore similar guidance should inform the review of the project. Staff looked
to Section 3.5.2.C of the Code, “Telecommunications Tower,” to provide the best guidance to inform this report.

A Telecommunications Tower in the RC Zone is a Limited Use or Conditional Use in the land use table. This tower would exceed the maximum height limit (179 feet) and the size limit of the omni-directional antennae (15 feet). For these reasons Staff compared the Public Use PSSM tower to the Conditional Use standards in the Code.

In the Conditional Use process, the Hearing Examiner is the approving body for those applications. However, this is application is for Mandatory Referral only and the Hearing Examiner is not involved in this Application and is only referenced below to demonstrate how the Zoning Code is written.

The Conditional Use standards for a Telecommunications Tower are numerous, but because the application is for a Mandatory Referral and not a Conditional Use, these standards are not mandatory; only the most pertinent standards from §59.3.5.2.C.2.c are discussed below.

1. Before the Hearing Examiner approves any conditional use for a Telecommunications Tower, the proposed facility must be reviewed by the County Transmission Facility Coordinating Group. The applicant for a conditional use must file a recommendation from the Transmission Facility Coordinating Group with the Hearing Examiner at least 5 days before the date set for the public hearing. The recommendation must be no more than 90 days old.

The Transmission Facility Coordinating Group “Recommended (approval), conditioned on approval through the Mandatory Referral process” the tower application at its January 3, 2018 meeting.

2. A Telecommunications Tower must be set back from the property line, as measured from the base of the support structure, as follows:

   (b) In Residential Detached zones, a distance of one foot for every foot of height or 300 feet from an existing dwelling, whichever provides the greater setback.

There are no existing dwelling units within 300 feet of the proposed tower location. This proposed tower does meet the recommended setback.

3. The maximum height of a support structure and antenna is 135 feet, unless it can be demonstrated that additional height up to 179 feet is needed for service, collocation, or public safety communication purposes. At the completion of construction, before the support structure may be used to transmit any signal, and before the final inspection required by the building permit, the applicant must certify to DPS that the height and location of the support structure conforms with the height and location of the support structure on the building permit.

The proposed height of 240 feet (including lightning rod); While it does exceed the height normally allowed under a Conditional Use the height is necessary for public safety communication purposes.
iv. The support structure must be located to minimize its visual impact. Screening under Division 6.5 is not required, however, the Hearing Examiner may require the support structure to be less visually obtrusive by use of screening, coloring, stealth design, or other visual mitigation options, after considering the height of the structure, topography, existing vegetation and environmental features, and nearby residential properties.

Screening at ground level is sufficient when incorporating the existing vegetation between the tower and River Road. Additionally, the Applicant is proposing landscaping that will further buffer the equipment shelter and the base of the proposed tower. Staff has included this in their recommendations.

viii. The equipment compound must have sufficient area to accommodate equipment sheds or cabinets associated with all the carriers. Outdoor storage of equipment or other items is prohibited.

The equipment compound contains an 11’ 8” x 30’ shelter with an internal generator next to the tower and has sufficient area inside for the required equipment. No outdoor storage is proposed.

ix. The support structure must be removed at the cost of the owner of the Telecommunications Tower when the Telecommunications Tower is no longer in use by any wireless communication carrier for more than 12 months.

Staff has included this provision in its comments.

x. The support structure must be identified by a sign 2 square feet or smaller, affixed to the support structure or any equipment building. The sign must identify the owner and the maintenance service provider of the support structure or any attached antenna and provide the telephone number of a person to contact regarding the structure. The sign must be updated and the Hearing Examiner notified within 10 days of any change in ownership.

Staff has included this provision in its comments.

xi. Each owner of the Telecommunications Tower is responsible for maintaining the wireless communications tower in a safe condition.

Staff has included this provision in its comments.

Alternative Site Analysis

Numerous alternative sites were investigated to identify sites that satisfy a) 95 percent coverage reliability, b) high level river coverage, and c) effective line-of-sight communication to the rest of the system. The majority of sites failed to satisfy one of these criteria and were eliminated for technological requirements. The Table below contains eleven sites that were considered for this tower: four of them were not technologically viable; four were privately owned and the owners denied the request for the tower. The remaining three were various county and state park properties, Calithea Farm, Blockhouse
Point Park, and Seneca Creek State Park. All three park locations were not supported by the administering agencies for various reasons.

Table 1: Alternative Site Locations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Calithea Farm</td>
<td>County, administered by M-NCPPC Parks</td>
<td>- Land covenant restricting use to a park. - Land is being used as a horse farm. Tenant is leasing site from County and M-NCPPC. Part of property would have to be condemned by the County to invalidate lease.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca Creek State Park</td>
<td>State</td>
<td>Filed application with State DNR. DNR advised the County not to pursue this site.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finegan Farm HOA</td>
<td>HOA</td>
<td>owner denied request for a tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca Farm LLC</td>
<td>private individual</td>
<td>owner denied request for a tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15107 River Rd.</td>
<td>private individual</td>
<td>owner denied request for a tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15220 River Rd.</td>
<td>private individual</td>
<td>owner denied request for a tower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>River Rd. &amp; Partnership Rd.</td>
<td>private individual</td>
<td>not technologically viable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broad Run Stream Valley Park (SVP)</td>
<td>County, administered by M-NCPPC Parks</td>
<td>not technologically viable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry Seneca Run Stream Valley Park (SVP)</td>
<td>County, administered by M-NCPPC Parks</td>
<td>not technologically viable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugarland SP</td>
<td>County, administered by M-NCPPC Parks</td>
<td>not technologically viable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blockhouse Point Park</td>
<td>County, administered by M-NCPPC Parks</td>
<td>Parks indicated the County could not build a tower at this site due to a large gas pipeline running through middle of the site, its historical significance related to the Civil War, and an existing land covenant.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

After these initial sites were evaluated and the Applicant engaged in dialogue with the community, additional sites were discussed and evaluated. The Applicant found an additional possible tower location on the proposed site on the east side of the property near the manager’s house, but ultimately decided to proceed with the original location.
Transportation

The project will be an unmanned facility that will generate no more than 10 visits per day. Therefore, normal operations of the facility will generate less than 50 total weekday peak-hour person trips and the project is therefore exempt from the Local Area Transportation Review (LATR) test and any requirement for further traffic analysis.

According to the 2002 Potomac Subregion Master Plan, River Road in front of the subject property has a designated right-of-way of 80 feet and is classified as an Arterial Road with two travel lanes. The subject property was platted in 1998 and 40 feet from the centerline of the road was dedicated at that time along the length of the property where this dedication was not already in place.

The 2018 Countywide Bicycle Master Plan calls for bikeable shoulders on River Road between W. Willard Road and Seneca Road. The proposed project covers only a small portion of the entire frontage of the property (less than 200 feet over the total 3,500 feet of property frontage); requiring this improvement along the entire frontage of the property is disproportional and therefore inappropriate.

FOREST CONSERVATION

The County’s Forest Conservation Law, Chapter 22A, is applicable; this project is exempt under section 22A-5(f). The exemption #42018096E was confirmed by Staff on December 21, 2017.

IMPACTS TO PARKLAND

M-NCPPC Park Staff said the proposed public safety tower is on the Bretton Woods property, the proposal is adjacent to Seneca Landing Special Park but does not directly impact M-NCPPC Department of Parks property.

COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND NOTIFICATION

This Application was noticed in accordance with the Uniform Standards for Mandatory Referral Review. Several adjoining property owners and a civic association were notified.

The community meeting was held for this site on 9/26/17. There were approximately 20 attendees from the neighborhood. The discussion mainly revolved around three items: safety of the tower including setback; aesthetics of the tower including the aircraft warning light; and functioning of the radio system in general and benefits to the community. One person left in staunch opposition and one person left with concerns about it affecting their house, but generally the attendees displayed appreciation for an explanation of the project. Several were satisfied, after seeing the photo simulations, that the tower would likely not be visible from their houses.

There has been ongoing communication between the Applicant, County officials, and the community. The Applicant decided it was best to move forward with the Application as originally submitted. The main concern from the community is visual impacts on the area especially the Agricultural Reserve and the Seneca Historical District.
Staff has received one letter from Heritage Montgomery dated March 11, 2019 in opposition to the application especially the location of the tower and its direct impacts on the character and quality of the county’s heritage resources.

Additionally, Staff has been provided correspondence that was sent directly to the County Council and Council Staff. The major themes were the placement of the tower, lack of transparency between County DTS Staff and the community, and that despite the efforts of all agencies involved that the original location was selected and not the alternate location near the manager’s house on the Bretton Woods property.

CONCLUSION

Staff recommends that the Planning Board approve the Mandatory Referral and transmit to the Department of Technological Services the comments and recommendations of this report.

The current first responders radio system fails to provide adequate radio coverage in several areas in the County, including the Potomac River area. The manufacturer’s support for the existing voice radio system began being phased out at the end of 2009. The proposed PSSM tower will fill in the coverage gap in the Potomac River area and will provide greater reliability, allowing police, fire, medical, and other first responders to react more quickly and efficiently in an emergency. The Applicant has demonstrated that the proposed location is well suited to cover the part of the County surrounding Potomac River. The Class III structural standards provide an extremely safe facility.

As a Public Use, the proposed tower is not required to meet the standards of a Telecommunications Tower. However, Staff applied Telecommunications Tower review criteria to this project and finds that it meets most of these standards; Staff has recommended that many of these standards be applied to this project. The failure to locate the facility within a transmission line right-of-way and the exceedance of the antenna size standards are acceptable for a project that serves the health, safety, and welfare of the public.

Attachment A – Mandatory Referral Package
Attachment B – Community Correspondence
Attachment C – Original Application Postponement Requests
Attachment D – Site Photo Simulation of Impacts (Balloon Test)
Attachment A
Montgomery County Planning Department  
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission

Re: Montgomery County Department of Technology Services  
Radio Communications Services  
Public Safety System Modernization Project

Site: Bretton Woods  
15700 River Road  
39°04'40.32"N, 77°20'14.66"W

Please accept the enclosed application and materials in support of Montgomery County Radio Communications Services' proposal to construct a new tower facility at the location described above.

RCS, part of the Montgomery County Department of Technology Services, operates communications networks for the use of Montgomery County emergency services, including police, fire, and medical first responders. RCS is tasked with ensuring that these emergency responders have effective and reliable radio coverage throughout the County coverage area.

When the 800 MHz radio system was first deployed in Montgomery County, technical barriers limited the number of base stations that could be developed. The current system fails to provide adequate radio coverage in several areas in the County, particularly as the County continues to modernize and urbanize. New technologies currently being implemented, however, will allow the development of additional sites to expand radio coverage.

These new base stations are sited and designed to provide complete and effective coverage according to a “95/95” coverage mandate: 95% coverage reliability in 95% of the County service area. Coverage reliability is calculated according to expected loss “zones” throughout the County. The County service area includes all areas within the border of Montgomery County, Maryland, including waterways, and all areas within three miles of the County border. New base stations must be sited within the existing network framework to provide optimum coverage and reliability.

Effective public safety radio serves the public health, safety, and welfare of Montgomery County residents. Where no existing site can provide adequate radio coverage, there are significant consequences for emergency response personnel. A lack of radio service can increase response time, the number of personnel required to effectively respond to an emergency situation, and the amount of time it takes to resolve an incident.
RCS is proposing to construct a new tower at the location described above to fill coverage gaps left by the existing legacy system. The proposed site would consist of a 230’ lattice tower, designed to support RCS antennas and equipment, and an associated compound at the base of the tower.

If you have any questions or concerns, or need any further information regarding this application, please free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Justin David Blanset
Network Building + Consulting

908.902.9110
jblanset@nbcllc.com
Statements of Compliance

This submission complies with the requirements of the Montgomery County Mandatory Referral submission guidelines as follows.

1) The proposed facility is an unmanned communications facility. There will be no regular occupation of the compound or associated shelter. Routine maintenance will not exceed 2 visits per month. As such:
   a. The facility operates 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, as a radio communications base station.
   b. The facility conforms in all respects to the General Plan. As an unmanned radio site for county public safety use, it has no notable effect on long or short term land development. The build-out plan for the Montgomery County Public Safety Radio Communications System is designed to accommodate and support the Wedges and Corridors concept.
   c. As an unmanned facility outside the right of way, the facility has no impact on pedestrian and bicycle traffic. The facility’s use as a public safety radio base station will promote pedestrian and cyclist safety in the area.
   d. No new roadway is proposed.
   e. A Historic Work Permit will be acquired if the National Environmental Policy Act determines an effect on County-designated historic properties. No effect is expected.
   f. There is no phasing plan; the construction will begin once all applicable approvals and permits are obtained.
   g. The subject property is in private ownership in fee simple. The County will maintain a lease to the subject area of the property.
   h. The project is funded by County funds specifically designated for the project.
   i. No impact is expected on public parkland or lands owned by M-NCPFC, as the project is proposed on private property. The facility’s use as a public safety radio base station will promote safe enjoyment of parkland in the area.
   j. LEED certification is not applicable to this type of facility.

2) The general location map is included in the enclosed drawings.

3) The site plan is included in the enclosed drawings.

4) Utilities and affected rights of way are included in the enclosed drawings.

5) Site ingress and egress are shown in the enclosed drawings, including the proposed site access driveway.

6) A Natural Resource Inventory is included with this submission.

7) The subject property is not in a Special Protection Area.

8) To the extent applicable, a waiver is requested from Forest Conservation Plan requirements.

9) Topographic contours are shown in the enclosed drawings.

10) Stormwater impact calculations are shown on the enclosed drawings. To the extent required, a Stormwater Concept Plan or Sediment Control Plan will be submitted to the Department of Permitting Services.

11) Landscaping plans are shown on the enclosed drawings. No exterior lighting is proposed aside from that required by the Federal Aviation Administration, subject to an Air Hazard Navigation Report.

12) The proposed facility is part of the Public Safety System Modernization Project. An area map showing the location of all affected radio communications sites is included.

13) The proposed facility complies with the Montgomery County Noise Ordinance, Section 31(b) of the Montgomery County Code, and is consistent with the Montgomery County Department of Park and
Planning Noise Guidelines. The site will not produce noise in excess of that allowed by the ordinance or guidelines.

14) All relevant architectural diagrams are included in the enclosed drawings.

15) No traffic impact is expected. The facility is unmanned and unoccupied, and routine maintenance visits are expected to be limited to one visit twice per month.
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<td>General Notes and Legend</td>
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**Tower Elevation**

**Antenna/Appurtenance Location Chart**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANTENNA ID</th>
<th>MANUFACTURER</th>
<th>MODEL</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>LENGTH</th>
<th>BOTTOM ELEV</th>
<th>RAD CENTER</th>
<th>TOP ELEV.</th>
<th>AZIMUTH</th>
<th>QTY.</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>MANUFACTURER</th>
<th>MODEL</th>
<th>SIZE</th>
<th>QTY.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N1</td>
<td>COMMSCOPE</td>
<td>HP6-9F</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>6.0'</td>
<td>217.0'</td>
<td>220.0'</td>
<td>223.0'</td>
<td>304.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WAVEGUIDE</td>
<td>COMMSCOPE</td>
<td>EWP63</td>
<td>2''</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N2</td>
<td>GSA</td>
<td>PAR6-59</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>6.0'</td>
<td>187.0'</td>
<td>190.0'</td>
<td>193.0'</td>
<td>304.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WAVEGUIDE</td>
<td>COMMSCOPE</td>
<td>EWP63</td>
<td>2''</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N3</td>
<td>GSA</td>
<td>PAR6-59</td>
<td>MW</td>
<td>6.0'</td>
<td>187.0'</td>
<td>190.0'</td>
<td>193.0'</td>
<td>29.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>WAVEGUIDE</td>
<td>COMMSCOPE</td>
<td>EWP63</td>
<td>2''</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N4</td>
<td>SICBRAIR</td>
<td>SC412-HF2LD</td>
<td>RX</td>
<td>20.9'</td>
<td>165.0'</td>
<td>175.0'</td>
<td>185.0'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>COAX</td>
<td>COMMSCOPE</td>
<td>AVA5-50</td>
<td>7/8''</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>TTA</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>COAX</td>
<td>COMMSCOPE</td>
<td>LDF4-50</td>
<td>1/2''</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N6</td>
<td>SICBRAIR</td>
<td>SC412-HF2LD</td>
<td>TX</td>
<td>20.9'</td>
<td>140.0'</td>
<td>150.5'</td>
<td>160.9'</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>COAX</td>
<td>COMMSCOPE</td>
<td>AVA6-50</td>
<td>1-1/4''</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General Notes**

2. All electrical transmission line runs from the Antenna shall be grounded near the top and bottom of the Tower to ground the line and provide lightning protection. Grounds are to be installed and tested in conformance with all applicable codes.
3. **Grounding** - The Antenna shall be connected to the Tower via a suitable grounding system that complies with all applicable codes.
4. **Lighting Protection** - All lightning protection devices shall be installed in accordance with applicable codes. The lightning protection system shall be designed to protect the Antenna from lightning damage.
5. **Tower Elevation** - All tower elevations shall be verified with appropriate devices and design criteria.
Definition of Structure Class – ANSI/TIA-222-G

Structure Class I: Structures that due to height, use or location represent a low hazard to human life and damage to property in the event of a failure and/or used for services that are optional and/or where a delay in returning the services would be acceptable.

Commentary: Failure of the structure defined as Structure Class I typical only affects the owner, although service provided may affect other users. Human life is essentially not at risk and the public well-being is largely unaffected by tower failure.

Structure Class II: Structures that due to height, use or location represent a significant hazard to human life and/or damage to property in the event of failure and/or used for services that may be provided by other means.

Commentary: Failure of a structure defined as Structure Class II presents significant hazard to human life and/or property if a tower fails. Significant with respect to human life means failure of the structure could result in injury or casualties, but it’s very limited in practicality (e.g. someone was on the tower at the time or tower happened to collapse onto persons, during an extreme climatic event (wind, ice or seismic event)). Significant with respect to property means property surrounding the tower could be damaged or destroyed. With respect to reliability, the phrase “Used for services that may be provided by other means” signifies redundancy of service. This redundancy is present in almost all public wireless service, including E911 networks.

Structure Class III: Structures that due to height, use or location represent a substantial hazard to human life and/or damage to property in the event of failure and/or used primarily for essential communications.

Commentary: Failure of a structure defined as Structure Class III presents significant hazard to human life and/or property if a tower fails. Essential communications include critical public safety (i.e., police, fire, emergency medical), public utility service, commercial communications, and national defense.

Number of Attaching Entities Rule is Met: If the majority of the attaching entities on a tower structure offer essential communications, the tower structure should be classified Class III. However, if redundancy exists and the communication service can be supported/filled by a neighboring tower, the structure shall be designated CLASS II.
Commentary: With respect to reliability, Class III structures represent towers for which the owner/provider cannot tolerate any loss of the network/signal, due to either types of services provided or zero redundancy existing in the network. Beyond zero redundancy, failure could also potentially impact other services, such as power, water, transportation, etc. that are considered essential to human life. Finally, Structure Class III can be defined as when a high risk to life/safety exists in the event of a failure of the structure. The risk is exemplified when the public venue is not mobile (e.g. hospital, school, large public emergency gathering facility).

**Return Periods of Structure Class I, II, and III**

- **Class I**
  - Return Period: 300 years
  - Importance factor = 0.87
  - 13% reduction in wind pressure in comparison to Structure Class II
  - Chance of exceedance of design wind force within 50 years = 15%

- **Class II**
  - Return Period: 700 years
  - Importance factor = 1.0
  - Chance of exceedance of design wind force within 50 years = 7%

- **Class III**
  - Return Period: 1700 years
  - Importance factor = 1.15
  - 15% increase in wind pressures in comparison to Structure Class II
  - Chance of exceedance of design wind force within 50 years = 3%

It is important to clarify that even under extremely high wind loads, tower structures experience minimal damage. Experiences have shown that most catastrophic tower failures occur as a result of complete devastation of the surrounding area due to Acts of God, such as tornado or impact from flying debris. Many instances have occurred where Class II towers have withstood wind well above design and only received damage to the antennas, mounts, and coax cabling attached to the structure.
Definition of Risk Category – ASCE 7-10

The ASCE 7 Standard, Minimum Design Loads for Buildings and Other Structures provides the basis for structural load calculation for both TIA-222 and the International Building Code. The latest version of the ASCE 7-10 dictates classification of buildings and other structures by way of assignment of a Risk Category. Per ASCE 7-10, Risk Categories are to be determined from ASCE 7-10 Table 1.5-1 and are based on the risk to human life, health, and welfare associated with damage or failure by nature of occupancy or use.

Once Risk Category is established, importance factors are to be determined based on ASCE 7-10, Table 1.5-2. These importance factors are included in the derivation of design loads for flood, wind, snow, earthquake, and ice applied to the structure during design and analysis.

![Table 1.5-1 Risk Category of Buildings and Other Structures for Flood, Wind, Snow, Earthquake, and Ice Loads](image-url)
Montgomery County Planning Department  
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission

Re: Montgomery County Department of Technology Services  
Radio Communications Services  
Public Safety System Modernization Project

Site: Bretton Woods  
15700 River Road  
39°04'40.32"N, 77°20'14.66"W

This is in response to your comments and requests for information regarding Mandatory Referral file MR2018011, for Montgomery County RCS’s proposed radio communication tower at 15700 River Road.

Supplementary Planning Requests:

Class III Structures

The proposed tower is designed as a Class III structure under ANSI/TIA-222-G (“RevG”). RevG provides guidelines on wind and weather conditions that dictate the forces a tower must be able to withstand. Class III structures represent towers for which the owner / provider cannot tolerate any loss, whether due to service impact or life / safety impact. As a result, Class III structures are designed to withstand catastrophic scenarios.

Under RevG, a Class III structure features a “return period” of 1700 years, meaning that the actual observed wind speed is statistically likely to meet or exceed the design wind load only once every 1700 years. It should be noted that even at the design wind load the tower will not necessarily experience a failure, only that the tower is designed to withstand such loading at a minimum.

These design wind loads significantly exceed the design loads of typical residential homes. As a result, they are capable of withstanding storms that would otherwise devastate nearby structures. They are frequently among the last structures standing after a catastrophic weather event. Examples of other structures that receive Class III categorization include elementary schools and child care facilities, assisted living facilities, prisons, and power and potable water treatment stations.

A summary of these categories is provided in attached documentation.
Location and Screening

Why is the tower located so close to River Road?

The location chosen is at or near the highest elevation available on the western half of the property, at approximately 234 feet AMSL. This is necessary to ensure both river and inland coverage are sufficient to meet the radio system’s requirements. Moving the tower within the subject property results in less desirable locations for various reasons:

- Much of the property closer to the river is at a lower elevation, which would cause coverage degradation. The proposed location allows for acceptable coverage both on the river and inland.
- There are residential houses on the same site of Rileys Lock Road. The proposed location maximizes the distance between the tower and those houses while maintaining its position west of the golf course.
- The majority of the property is occupied by the golf course and is not appropriate or available for development.
- The eastern section of the property contains a protected forest covered by an existing conservation plan. A new tower could not be developed in that area without significant impact to the protected stands. The proposed location does not impact any protected stands or specimen trees.

Why is no landscaping proposed to the north or south of the compound?

The proposed landscaping screens the compound from the golf course to the east and from the existing residential houses to the west. The area immediately to the south of the proposed compound is not in use, and existing tree cover screens the occupied portions of the property further south. The existing tree cover along River Road adequately screens the compound from the road. One set of photo simulations included with this submission was based on photographs taken during the winter, and demonstrates that there is adequate evergreen coverage to screen the compound.

Other Requests

The following documentation has been provided, per request:
- Results of balloon test and photo simulations for this location.
- Coverage impact maps for the system and the proposed location.
- A summary of alternate locations that were considered and the reason for not choosing them.

Transportation Notes:

The survey shows a frontage-to-frontage right of way dedication of 80 feet at the subject location. This significantly exceeds the actual paved width at the site.

RCS agrees with staff, per our telephone conversations, that a bike path or shoulder installation would not be appropriate in combination with this proposal. Only approximately 20 feet of the right of way will be occupied, while the property has over 3,600 feet of frontage on River Road. Applicant will ensure that the driveway is in good condition, and that disturbed areas are returned to such, for use by cyclists.
MCDOT Requests:

1) The facility is unmanned and will not generate more than 10 visits per day. Regular peak hours trips are not implied by the proposal.

2) Only approximately 20 feet of the more than 3,600 feet of frontage on River Road are impacted by the proposal. As a result, there will be no impact on bicycle and pedestrian access or safety.

3) The 80 foot dedicated right of way is called out on the plan.

4) RCS agrees with staff, per our telephone conversations, that a bike path or shoulder installation would not be appropriate in combination with this proposal. Only approximately 20 feet of the right of way will be occupied, while the property has over 3,600 feet of frontage on River Road. Applicant will ensure that the driveway is in good condition, and that disturbed areas are returned to such, for use by cyclists.

5) Applicant will comply to the extent required by the project proposal.

If you have any questions or concerns, or need any further information regarding this application, please free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Justin David Blanset

Justin David Blanset
Network Building + Consulting

908.902.9110
jblanset@nbcllc.com
Montgomery County Planning Department
Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission

Re: Montgomery County Department of Technology Services
    Radio Communications Services
    Public Safety System Modernization Project
Site: Bretton Woods
    15700 River Road
    39°04'40.32"N, 77°20'14.66"W


On July 30, 2019, the Montgomery County Council reviewed the proposed 22-site plan for the Public Safety System Modernization Project. The site identified above is included in the plan reviewed by the Council.

The Council resolved to amend the Capital Improvement Plan to include the following language:

    The Executive will locate these simulcast antenna sites at these identified sites to minimize costs to the County and meet the target cutover date of December 2020.

If you have any questions or concerns, or need any further information regarding this application, please free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Justin David Blanset
Network Building + Consulting

908.902.9110
jblanset@nbcllc.com
RESOLUTION NO.: 19-214
Introduced: July 9, 2019
Adopted: July 30, 2019

COUNTY COUNCIL
FOR MONTGOMERY COUNTY, MARYLAND

Lead Sponsors: Councilmembers Katz and Riemer

SUBJECT: Amendment to the FY19-24 Capital Improvements Program
Montgomery County Government
County Executive
Public Safety System Modernization (No. 340901)

Background

1. Section 302 of the Montgomery County Charter provides that the Council may amend an approved capital improvements program at any time by an affirmative vote of no fewer than six members of the Council.

2. This amendment identifies the specific 22 sites recommended by the County’s radio tower vendor needed to meet the public safety standard of 95% coverage by December 2020.

Action

The County Council for Montgomery County, Maryland approves the following resolution:

The FY19-24 Capital Improvements Program of the Montgomery County Government is amended to revise the Public Safety System Modernization project (No. 340901), as reflected on the attached project description form.

This is a correct copy of Council action.

Megan Davey Limarzi, Esq.
Clerk of the Council
## Public Safety System Modernization

**Category**: General Government  
**SubCategory**: County Offices and Other Improvements  
**Planning Area**: Countywide  
**Date Last Modified**: 01/11/19  
**Agency**: County Executive  
**Status**: Ongoing

### EXPENDITURE SCHEDULE ($000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cost Elements</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Thru FY18</th>
<th>Rem FY18</th>
<th>Total 6 Years</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>Beyond 6 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planning, Design and Supervision</td>
<td>9,543</td>
<td>3,379</td>
<td>5,229</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>33,594</td>
<td>2,635</td>
<td>15,859</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>15,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>67,615</td>
<td>67,615</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</strong></td>
<td><strong>110,752</strong></td>
<td><strong>73,629</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,088</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,035</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,035</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FUNDING SCHEDULE ($000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Thru FY18</th>
<th>Rem FY18</th>
<th>Total 6 Years</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>Beyond 6 Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G.O. Bonds</td>
<td>55,591</td>
<td>25,752</td>
<td>16,739</td>
<td>13,100</td>
<td>13,100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short-Term Financing</td>
<td>42,356</td>
<td>38,179</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Revenue: General</td>
<td>9,826</td>
<td>6,719</td>
<td>2,172</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>935</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Aid</td>
<td>2,947</td>
<td>2,947</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contributions</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDING SOURCES</strong></td>
<td><strong>110,752</strong></td>
<td><strong>73,629</strong></td>
<td><strong>21,088</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,035</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,035</strong></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT ($000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impact Type</th>
<th>Total 6 Years</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-Staff</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-Other</td>
<td>1,584</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NET IMPACT</strong></td>
<td><strong>6,384</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,064</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,064</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,064</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,064</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,064</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,064</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APPROPRIATION AND EXPENDITURE DATA ($000s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriation FY 20 Approp. Request</th>
<th>(96)</th>
<th>Year First Appropriation</th>
<th>FY09</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cumulative Appropriation</td>
<td>110,848</td>
<td>Last FY's Cost Estimate</td>
<td>110,848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure / Encumbrances</td>
<td>98,889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unencumbered Balance</td>
<td>11,959</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Public Safety System Modernization
This program will provide for phased upgrades and modernization of computer aided dispatch (CAD), law enforcement records management system (LE RMS), and voice radio systems used primarily by the County's public safety first responder agencies including Police, Fire and Rescue, Sheriff, Corrections and Rehabilitation, and Emergency Management and Homeland Security. The modernization will include replacement of the current CAD/LE RMS system, replacement of public safety mobile and portable radios, upgrade of non-public safety mobile and portable radios, and replacement of core voice radio communications infrastructure. The previously approved Fire Station Alerting System Upgrades project (CIP #451000) was transferred to this project in order to coordinate the upgrades with the new CAD system. The alerting system upgrades will modernize the fire station alerting systems at 43 existing work sites, maintaining the ability to notify fire and rescue stations of emergencies. The alerting system, including audible and data signals, is essential for the notification of an emergency and the dispatch of appropriate response units from the County. As voice, data, and video are beginning to converge to a single platform, this project will provide a pathway to a modern public safety support infrastructure that will enable the County to leverage technology advances and provide efficient and reliable systems for first responders. This project will follow the methodologies and strategies presented in the Public Safety Systems Modernization (PSSM) plan completed in July 2009.

**COST CHANGE**

Reduction in Federal Aid of $96,000.

**PROJECT JUSTIFICATION**

The public safety systems require modernization. The CAD system is reaching the end of useful life and does not meet the County's current operational requirements, impacting the response time of first responders to 9-1-1 calls. The CAD Roadmap Study, completed in March 2009, recommended replacement of the system to address existing shortcomings and prepare for the next generation 9-1-1 systems. The manufacturer's support for the voice radio system has begun to be phased out as of December 31, 2009. Beyond that date, the manufacturer will only continue to provide system support on an as available basis, but will not guarantee the availability of parts or technical resources. The CAD modernization has initiated a detailed planning phase that included the use of industry experts to assist with business process analysis and to develop detailed business and technical requirements for the new CAD system. This process will allow the County to incorporate lessons learned and best practices from other jurisdictions. As more of the County's regional partners migrate to newer voice technologies, it will affect interoperable voice communications. To ensure that the County maintains reliable and effective public safety (voice radio) communications for the operations of its first responders and to sustain communications interoperability for seamless mutual aid among its regional partners, the County needs to implement a project to upgrade and modernize its portable and mobile radio units and subsequently the radio voice communications infrastructure. Acceleration of the public safety radio purchases was initiated to take advantage of a Partial Payment in Lieu of Re-Banding offer from Sprint/Nextel toward the financing of new, upgraded, P-25 compliant public safety radios and to meet the Federal Communications Commission (FCC) mandated 800 MHZ frequency rebanding requirements for nationwide public safety radio frequency interoperability. Now, the installation of the new core radio communication infrastructure is needed. The fire station alerting system upgrades were identified as a need under Section 5 of the MCFRS Master Plan (adopted by the County Council in October 2005) and detailed in the Station Alerting and Public Address (SA/PA) System for Fire/Rescue Stations, Rev 1, 2006. This project allows for the continuous and seamless functioning of the alerting systems within each fire station. A preliminary survey by DTS of existing conditions at all stations revealed system-wide concerns, including inadequate spare parts inventory and lack of available maintenance support for alerting systems.

**OTHER**

$20,936 million was appropriated in FY11 to purchase P-25 compliant radios that allowed the County to complete immediate re-banding within the 800 MHZ frequency as required by the FCC. The radio replacement program includes the M-NCPPC Montgomery County Park Police. The future purchase of public safety radios (other than to replace broken equipment) must be able to be supported by a P25 Phase-2 compliant infrastructure. The use of State of Maryland infrastructure will be aggressively pursued in
order to minimize costs to Montgomery County. The CAD procurement request will reflect the County's interest in maintaining the station alerting functionality at the current level or better through the CAD system. The RFP for CAD replacement will include replacement of the following systems: CAD, mapping, and the existing Law Enforcement Records Management and Field Reporting systems. Coordination with participating department/agencies and regional partners will continue throughout the project.

**FISCAL NOTE**

Funding in FY09 included Urban Area Security Initiative (UASI) grant funding of $2.055 million and Fire Act grant funding of $988,000. Funding schedule reflects FY18 supplemental adding $32,000 in Contributions for additional equipment required for Local Fire Rescue Departments (LFRDs). FY18 funding switch is due to a transfer of Current Revenue General for $283,000 from Technology Modernization (MCG) project offset by an equal reduction in Short Term Financing.

**COORDINATION**

PSSM Executive Steering Committee, Executive Program Directors, Department of Technology Services, Department of Police, Montgomery County Fire and Rescue Service, Sheriff's Office, Department of Correction and Rehabilitation, Office of Emergency Management and Homeland Security, Department of Transportation, Department of Liquor Control, Montgomery County Public Schools (MCPS), Maryland-National Park and Planning Commission (M-NCPPC) Park Police, Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority (WMATA)
The core voice radio communications infrastructure replacement has identified the following 22 trunked simulcast antenna sites for the new system, as also shown on the map below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sites</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bethesda</td>
<td>5202 River Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Rock</td>
<td>17410 Black Rock Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bretton Woods</td>
<td>15700 River Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brookeville</td>
<td>4301 Brookeville Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burtonsville</td>
<td>16135 Old Columbia Pike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carole Highlands</td>
<td>1616 Hannon Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castle Blvd.</td>
<td>14000 Castle Blvd.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damascus</td>
<td>26154 Ridge Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dickerson</td>
<td>21200 Martinsburg Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elmer School</td>
<td>18500 Elmer School Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Office Building</td>
<td>101 Monroe Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station 16</td>
<td>111 University Blvd. East</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Station 30</td>
<td>9404 Falls Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germantown</td>
<td>20235 Observation Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grosvenor</td>
<td>10101 Grosvenor Place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hampshire Greens</td>
<td>15916 New Hampshire Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICC/Georgia Avenue</td>
<td>15912 Georgia Avenue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County Correctional Facility</td>
<td>22880 Whelan Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear Regulatory Commission</td>
<td>11555 Rockville Pike</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Penn Shop</td>
<td>18800 Penn Shop Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shady Grove</td>
<td>8620 Pleasant Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Oak</td>
<td>11215 Oakleaf Drive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Executive will locate these simulcast antenna sites at these identified sites to minimize costs to the County and meet the target cutover date of December 2020.
Attachment B
March 11, 2019

Re: MR2018-011 / RCS @ Bretton Woods

To Whom It May Concern:

In early 2018, a number of County organizations met with former County Executive Leggett to express concern about the location chosen for the emergency cell tower which would serve the northwestern portion of the County. At that time, a site for the tower at Bretton Woods had been chosen without adequate discussion with citizens, interested parties, and the Department of Technology Services (DTS).

The outcomes from that meeting were as follows:

• It was agreed that there is an absolute need for emergency cell service in the area.
• It was agreed that a cell tower was the best solution to provide the service.
• It was noted that the tower location was determined by the County’s contractor who had not visited the site.
• DTS did not wish to explore other sites as they were ready to proceed with installation in the fall of 2018.
• Mr. Leggett strongly disapproved of the Bretton Woods site and clearly instructed DTS to find another location.

Working with DTS, a number of alternate sites were submitted to DTS for consideration. Several of these sites were assessed and found to be acceptable locations for the cell tower and were in more discreet locations.

Moving ahead to winter 2019, we find that the cell tower is not being relocated but will in fact be erected at the Bretton Woods site as initially proposed by DTS.

At this time, Heritage Montgomery joins a number of other concerned organizations and citizens by again requesting that the cell tower be moved to a site where it will not diminish the quality of the historic, cultural, and natural resources of several of the most viable economic tourism drivers in the County.
The current tower location will have a negative impact on economic development in the following ways:

• It will be plainly visible along several miles of River Road, a State-designated Maryland Scenic Byway (https://www.roads.maryland.gov/index.aspx?Pageid=97), numerous heritage sites, and the southern gateway to the Agricultural Reserve*. The tower is message-bearing, it sets a tone of randomness and obtrusive and careless planning in a very carefully developed and maintained landscape.

• River Road is the main access and thus the first experience for visitors travelling to the C&O Canal Towpath Trail*, which hosts 5.1 million visitors a year, and surrounding heritage sites. The tower will be the first impression and a prominent feature in the direct and indirect viewsheds of Riley’s Lock*, Seneca Aqueduct*, Seneca Quarry*, Violette’s Lock*, Seneca Schoolhouse*, Poole’s Store*, Blockhouse Point*, McKee-Breshers Wildlife Management Area, a number of Montgomery Park* sites, designated Rustic Roads*, and Seneca Creek State Park*.

• The proposed tower site is in the Seneca National Historic District and will dominate the skyline. Attached, please find the National Register nomination which clearly lays out the significance of the area.

• Local establishments such as Rocklands Farm Winery and others have located their businesses in the area specifically because it offers a relaxed rural ambience for their guests to enjoy and is near the agricultural producers who supply their establishments. It is hard to sell visitors on sipping a glass of wine overlooking a bucolic landscape capped by a cell tower.

• Significant Native American* and African American* sites are being preserved and developed into cohesive trails and tours by Heritage Montgomery in response to increasing national and international demand. Most of the remaining sites of these cultural heritages are located in this area of the County.

There are three plans governing the spirit of actions which alter this landscape. They are the Montgomery County Preservation Plan, the Agricultural Reserve Master Plan, and the Heritage Tourism Alliance of Montgomery County (Heritage Montgomery) Master Plan. Each plan provides clear direction toward the goals of maintaining and protecting this area.

The tower will result in a diminished experience of the things we say we value.

Please reconsider this location so the directional catch phrase in our nationally renowned protected rural and forested Reserve doesn’t become “Take a left about 2 miles past the cell tower, you can’t miss it” rather than “Have you seen how beautifully the history, culture and natural resources are showcased in Montgomery County’s working rural landscape.”

As we prepare to submit over $600,000 in FY 2020 grant requests for Montgomery County projects to the Maryland State Heritage Areas Authority – specifically for preservation, enhancement, and economic development through tourism – it is my hope that I will be able to tell our State funders that Montgomery County continues to be deeply committed to being the leader of conscientious stewardship in the State.
I believe that all interested parties can come together and design a solution that both provides emergency cell service and respects the context of the landscape in which it will placed.

I will be happy to give you a tour of the proposed alternate sites at your request.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Executive Director
director@HeritageMontgomery.org

* Denotes heritage tourism destinations which are eligible for or in most cases have received State project or capital funding through Heritage Montgomery.
Josh,

See thread below. I am renewing the content of these emails in my comments to you as you prepare staff report. My thoughts are unchanged since these communications were sent.

Take note that Casey Anderson had taken time as well as staff members of Parks and the executive’s administration to advance alternative sites. During that time and despite the expenditure of resources, DTS staff was moving ahead with the original site without revealing that they were doing so. They never had any intention of finding a more suitable site and aimed to box the county in. That’s really outrageous.

C

Caroline Taylor, Executive Director
Montgomery Countryside Alliance
P.O. Box 24, Poolesville, Maryland 20837
301-461-9831
http://mocoalliance.org/

“Whether we and our politicians know it or not, Nature is party to all our deals and designs, and she has more votes, a larger memory, and a sterner sense of justice than we do." ~Wendell Berry

Begin forwarded message:

From: Caroline Taylor <caroline@mocoalliance.org>
Date: June 17, 2019 at 7:07:32 PM EDT
To: Nancy Navarro <councilmember.navarro@montgomerycountymd.gov>,
councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov, councilmember.hucker@montgomerycountymd.gov,
Hans Riemen <Councilmember.Riemer@montgomerycountymd.gov>,
councilmember.albornoz@montgomerycountymd.gov
Cc: Joy.Nurmi@montgomerycountymd.gov, Cathy Matthews
<catherine.matthews@montgomerycountymd.gov>, Dale Tibbitts
<Dale.Tibbitts@montgomerycountymd.gov>, councilmember.friedson@mccouncilmd.lmhostediq.com,
Kkiplinger@kiplinger.com, Tom Gutierrez <TGutierrez@fcclaw.com>,
director@heritagemontgomery.org

Subject: Fwd: Bretton Woods Radio Tower - Process and Request... I am the one of the ones...

Dear Council President and Council Committee Members,
I am sharing my concern regarding the representations made in the committee briefing packet (page 5) for the meeting that is to take place tomorrow afternoon regarding the siting of a public safety tower proximate to the southern gateway to the Agricultural Reserve. The packet indicates that only one person has raised issue with the original proposed site at Bretton Woods Country Club. That is incorrect. You may have received correspondence on this matter including from my colleague Sarah Rogers from the Maryland Heritage Tourism Alliance.

From first hearing of this potential tower site in early 2018 to today, stakeholders have sought to collaboratively and respectfully advance the siting of this tower to achieve both technical feasibility and geographical harmony. Significant missteps in public process were acknowledged by DTS. The email thread below contains a timeline of our participation through much of last year. It underscores that we did not “complain” about the site but rather, acknowledging urgency to supply needed system upgrade, worked to advance a mutually agreeable solution in a timely fashion and per County Executive Leggett’s direction and public assurances, and DTS oversight.

**Most recently we were advised by the current County Executive’s office that a site location on the Bretton Woods property had been identified, was agreeable to the property owner, and can provide the system requirements and the compatibility to the historic rural community. Take note that we had suggested pursuing a site in that area early in 2018.**

And so we ask that you consider this issue in the context of the efforts that have been expanded and are ongoing, and the importance of the unique nature of the rural geography where the tower site is being proposed - a designated historic district at a major gateway to the Reserve. **Please support the well advanced and continuing collaborative effort to best locate this tower.**

Respectfully,

C

CC: Joy Nurmi
   Cathy Matthews
   Andrew Friedson
   Dale Tibbitts

Caroline Taylor, Executive Director
Montgomery Countryside Alliance
P.O. Box 24, Poolesville, Maryland  20837
301-461-9831

Chosen as "one of the best" charities in Greater Washington by the Catalogue for Philanthropy

"Whether we and our politicians know it or not, Nature is party to all our deals and designs, and she has more votes, a larger memory, and a sterner sense of justice than we do." ~ Wendell Berry

Begin forwarded message:
Re: MR2018-011 / RCS @ Bretton Woods

Dear Mr. Siegel,

I have reviewed the newly submitted application materials with regard to the above referenced proposed tower location. I am, to say the least, disappointed in the representations made there and elsewhere with regard to the process employed to date relating to this tower siting.

Since early 2018 upon first learning of this issue, stakeholders have undertaken to both collaboratively and expeditiously identify a solution addressing appropriate technical, public process, and stakeholder concerns. Issues of transparency, accuracy and abridgment of process remain deeply concerning.

That said, we believe that the best path forward will be achieved through transparency, accuracy, and collaboration. Surely that is the hallmark of good governance.

Note:
For reference regarding the process undertaken last year to facilitate the tower siting, see below. The timeline below does not include a subsequent document request submitted on behalf of stakeholders. OTS Communication with stakeholders ceased after the balloon tests were conducted in May of last year.

Sincerely,

Caroline Taylor, Executive Director
Montgomery Countryside Alliance
P.O. Box 24, Poolesville, Maryland 20837
301-461-9831
http://mocoalliance.org/

Chosen as "one of the best" charities in Greater Washington by the Catalogue for Philanthropy

"Whether we and our politicians know it or not, Nature is party to all our deals and designs, and she has more votes, a larger memory,
Begin forwarded message:

From: Sarah Rogers  
<director@heritagemontgomery.org>  
Date: April 30, 2018 at 1:30:59 PM EDT  
To: Caroline Taylor <caroline@mocoalliance.org>  
Cc: "Matthews, Catherine" <Catherine.Matthews@montgomerycountymd.gov>,  
"Nurmi, Joy" <Joy.Nurmi@montgomerycountymd.gov>,  
Tom Gutierrez <TGutierrez@fcclaw.com>, Dolores Milmoe <milmoe@mac.com>, Knight Kiplinger <kkiplinger@kiplinger.com>  
Subject: Re: Bretton Woods Radio Tower - Process and Request

Greetings All,
Calathea Special Park, located at 15000 River Road, is not an MHT designated site. As far as I can see it is part of the Heritage Area, a MNCPPC park, and is bounded by a scenic byway. There are no historic structures or easements.
Best,
Sarah

On Sat, Apr 28, 2018 at 7:08 AM, Caroline Taylor <caroline@mocoalliance.org> wrote:
Thank you, as always, Cathy.
Take note that, in the time line, that last date entry should read April 27.

Warmly,
C

Caroline Taylor, Executive Director  
Montgomery Countryside Alliance  
P.O. Box 24, Poolesville, Maryland 20837  
301-461-9831  
http://mocoalliance.org/

Sent from my iPhone.
On Apr 27, 2018, at 9:41 PM, Matthews, Catherine <Catherine.Matthews@montgomerycountymd.gov> wrote:

Caroline,

Thank you for this summary. You have noted a couple of questionable statements — one attributed to me and one apparently to you. There also seems to be some confusion about the designation status of the Calathea Farm Park.

With this said, the community’s participation in this process is appreciated and I’ll continue to be available to help in this process when I can.

Joy,

Please let me know if/when there’s another briefing scheduled for the Executive on Bretton Woods.

Catherine Matthews
Director
Upcounty Regional Office
(o) 240-777-8040
(m) 240-328-4587 note new number!

Sent from my iPhone

On Apr 27, 2018, at 7:00 PM, Caroline Taylor <caroline@mocoalliance.org> wrote:

Joy,

As a follow up to your call this afternoon, I wanted to clarify the process to date, our position, and seek a written response to our submitted alternative sites.
Our River Road
Vicinity Radio Tower
Timeline

1) January 10, 2018 - MCA was first made aware of the proposed 230’ tower location.
2) January 11 - Contacted Executive's office to express concern with the location and ask for meeting.
3) January 30 - MCA, Heritage Montgomery, community members, met with Executive, OTS staff to discuss siting process, concerns and options. Mr. Leggett expressed significant concern with the proposed site at Bretton Woods (Reserve gateway) and directed staff to work to find a better alternative.
4) February 6 - MCA, Heritage Montgomery, community members, OTS, Cathy Matthews met and conducted a site visit at Bretton Woods. MCA, renewing concern with siting at that property, agreed to research and provide a list of potential alternative sites that met specified criteria provided by OTS.
5) February 9 - After thorough research, MCA provided a map with locations and elevations with criteria specified. (see attached). Take note: neither this list nor our
site visit commentary indicated that moving the tower on the Bretton Woods property was a satisfactory outcome in addressing stakeholder concerns.

6) February 13 - MCA, Joy Nurmi, OTS staff had a phone conference to discuss the mapped alternative sites. MCA was told that these would be vetted with Motorola. No further communication regarding the alternative sites was received.

7) March 28 - MCA received email from Darnestown Civic Association relaying community member concern resulting from being informed by OTS staff that MCA had recommended that the tower location be moved on Bretton Woods property to area directly behind Osbourne home.

8) April 2 - MCA email requesting status update

9) April 3 - Cathy Matthews forwards email regarding status from Judy Miller that read (in part):

I would like to give you an update on the Bretton Woods proposed tower location. The Radio project was asked by the Countryside Alliance to consider moving the tower further from River Rd. We chose an alternate location, however after looking at
it on a map, it turned out it was in direct view of a resident's rear window...

On Tuesday, 4/10, 1-4 pm we plan to do a balloon test for one or more proposed alternate locations. The balloon(s) will be up for the entire three hours. I will update you once we select a proposed alternate. This were sites on Bretton Woods property.

10) April 6 - Meeting with OTS, Bretton Woods neighbors, Motorola - MCA was not invited but nonetheless attended at the request of community members. Stakeholders were told that the OTS staff were directed to site the tower on the Bretton Woods property by Cathy Matthews per the direction of the County Executive. MCA staff made inquiry with Joy Nurmi who relayed that this was not accurate and the alternative site location process was not complete. MCA staff relayed content of the brief call to Judy Miller and those assembled. Ms. Miller indicated that the balloon testing at Bretton Woods would be cancelled. Motorola representatives said that a number of the alternative sites were potentially technically satisfactory. We were told that the vetting
process would continue.

11) April 22 - MCA receives phone call from Joy Nurmi asking for clarification as she was informed by OTS staff that MCA had stated that no balloon tests could occur on the Bretton Woods Property. I was surprised at this assertion and clarified that, rather, we have been waiting, per the direction at the April 6 meeting, for the word on the status of the eligibility of the alternative sites. I indicated that a balloon test is not up to us to allow or disallow but that other sites should not be dismissed without clear appropriate rationale and that other testing would be appropriate.

That was long but necessary to be clear on the process that has been undertaken to date. Upon first learning of the tower site at Bretton Woods, we have endeavored to provide timely and fact based input aimed toward serving public interest. Much in the way of planning and expenditure of both public and private funding have been made toward protecting the historic Seneca corridor... dictating great care be
undertaken in this siting process.

Our ask:

Please provide a current status of the review, including rationale if dismissed, of the sites that we provided as possible alternatives.

Joy, we did discuss one of the alternative locations - the Calathea Farm Park location - briefly today and I understood that Planning Commission Chair Casey Anderson communicated that that was not a viable as it is a historic Civil War site. I noted that we had taken care to avoid designated or culturally known historic areas in our siting process but that I would look into it. My research reveals the following: neither MHT nor P & P have that area listed as historic. I did find that the property was on a list of possible locations to host the confederate statue that was removed from Rockville. That statue, as you know, has found home at White’s Ferry. It may be that the inclusion on the list presented some confusion. Take note that that Bretton Woods property, however, is entirely located
within the nationally designated Seneca Historic District.

Respectfully,

C

<Bretton Woods alts 2 mi radius ct.pdf>
<Briefs,Criteria-description-Bretton Woods 2 miles alternative sites for review.pdf>

--
Sarah Rogers
Executive Director
Heritage Tourism Alliance
12535 Milestone Manor Lane
Germantown, Md. 20876
301-515-0753
Penn, Joshua

From: Caroline Taylor <caroline@mocoalliance.org>
Sent: Sunday, September 15, 2019 9:32 PM
To: Penn, Joshua
Subject: Fwd: No, I am the one-- Bretton Woods Radio 230' Radio Tower -- Please find another, less visible location

Another...

C

Caroline Taylor, Executive Director
Montgomery Countryside Alliance
P.O. Box 24, Poolesville, Maryland 20837
301-461-9831
http://mocoalliance.org/

“Whether we and our politicians know it or not, Nature is party to all our deals and designs, and she has more votes, a larger memory, and a sterner sense of justice than we do.” ~Wendell Berry

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Anne Sturm' via Info" <info@mocoalliance.org>
Date: June 17, 2019 at 9:27:56 AM EDT
To: Councilmember.Friedson@montgomerycountymd.gov
Cc: dale.tibbits@montgomerycountymd.gov
Subject: No, I am the one-- Bretton Woods Radio 230' Radio Tower -- Please find another, less visible location
Reply-To: Anne Sturm <annets1@aol.com>

Dear Councilmember Friedson,

In the Agriculture Reserve, Park and Planning and the Council have been sensitive to the visibility of cell towers. I understand totally the importance of the County's emergency services radio system. But, I do not understand why County staff pressed forward with this very problematic site when Co. Ex. Leggett, after a stake holder's meeting, asked that alternative sites be
identified. It is my understanding that contrary to what the County Council has been told, the County executive and staff have heard from numerous residents, adjacent neighbors, community, and historic preservation groups asking that the tower be placed in a less prominent location. As someone who has "used" that area a lot (bluebird and martin trail at Bretton Woods, camps for children on the course and in that area) I hope that the beautiful "feeling" can be preserved for all to enjoy.

Since there are a lot of us that care, I AM WRITING TO ASK FOR YOU TO CARE TOO.

Thank you for your hard work on behalf of our county. Your thoughtful consideration of this matter will be most appreciated.

Sincerely,

Anne Sturm
P.O. Box 341
Barnesville, Md. 20838
An adjacent neighbor...

C

Caroline Taylor, Executive Director
Montgomery Countryside Alliance
P.O. Box 24, Poolesville, Maryland 20837
301-461-9831
http://mocoalliance.org/

“Whether we and our politicians know it or not, Nature is party to all our deals and designs, and she has more votes, a larger memory, and a sterner sense of justice than we do.” ~Wendell Berry

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Judy Walsh' via Info" <info@mocoalliance.org>
Date: June 17, 2019 at 9:22:10 AM EDT
To: <councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov>,
<councilmember.hucker@montgomerycountymd.gov>,
<Councilmember.Albornoz@montgomerycountymd.gov>,
<councilmember.navarro@montgomerycountymd.gov>,
<Councilmember.Friedson@montgomerycountymd.gov>, <Dale.Tibbits@montgomerycountymd.gov>,
<Susan.Farag@montgomerycountymd.gov>
Subject: We are also the "ONEs" who want the Bretton Woods radio tower moved
Reply-To: "Judy Walsh" <jjaw@verizon.net>

The community of Seneca was never given the chance to supply input about the PSRS tower at Bretton Woods until it was already a "done deal". The whole system had been designed before any community input was sought. Having the tower near River Road & Riley's Lock Rd would definitely be an eyesore.

We've been working at finding a better solution for the last year, thanks to help from the Montgomery Countryside Alliance, and others. And we thought the County agreed with us when Ike Leggett asked that alternative sites be examined.

It's my understanding that an alternate solution has been found on the Bretton Woods property that would place the tower near their other communication tower, which is virtually invisible to neighbors and those travelling on River Road.
We respectfully ask that the County continue to pursue the alternate site and abandon the original site at Bretton Woods.

Sincerely,

John and Judith Walsh
16005 Seneca Rd.
Penn, Joshua

From: Caroline Taylor <caroline@mocoalliance.org>
Sent: Sunday, September 15, 2019 9:30 PM
To: Penn, Joshua
Subject: Fwd: Bretton Woods Radio 230’ Radio Tower

Josh,
I don’t want to send a bunch of emails to you but I do want to show you that there were folks that have written on this issue. There was a fair amount of frustration that the process was not transparent and that representations were made about opposition that were in accurate. See below.

C

Caroline Taylor, Executive Director
Montgomery Countryside Alliance
P.O. Box 24, Poolesville, Maryland  20837
301-461-9831
http://mocoalliance.org/

“Whether we and our politicians know it or not, Nature is party to all our deals and designs, and she has more votes, a larger memory, and a stern sense of justice than we do."  ~Wendell Berry

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Mary Wolfe" <malmaw117@gmail.com>
Date: June 17, 2019 at 4:54:04 PM EDT
To: <councilmember.katz@montgomerycountymd.gov>, <councilmember.hucker@montgomerycountymd.gov>, <Councilmember.Albornoz@montgomerycountymd.gov>, <councilmember.navarro@montgomerycountymd.gov>, <Dale.Tibbitts@montgomerycountymd.gov>, <Susan.Farag@montgomerycountymd.gov>
Subject: Bretton Woods Radio 230' Radio Tower

Dear Council Members and Staff:

As a 50-year resident of Montgomery county, I am concerned about the plans to site a 230’ radio tower with flashing nighttime lighting at Bretton Woods, which is a gateway to the Agricultural Reserve and a designated heritage area. I don’t believe a robust process was followed to consult the public, and the depth of residents’ concerns has been downplayed. Citizens have been working for a year plus to locate a place for the tower that would be technically viable, but not as negatively impactful on the area. A site meeting the criteria has been identified by the County Executive’s staff and they will help facilitate the process while the full system is being built out. Please reconsider the current plan and change the location of the tower to the location identified by the County Executive.
Sincerely,

Mary Wolfe
111 Beckwith St.
Gaithersburg, MD 20878
Attachment C
Fred, thanks for reaching out.

Please pull this item from the agenda.

Thanks again,

Greg Ossont  
Deputy Director  
Department of General Services  
240-777-6192  
greg.ossont@montgomerycountymd.gov

Frederick Vernon Boyd  
Community Planner  
Area 3 Planning Team  
Montgomery County Planning Department
8787 Georgia Avenue
Silver Spring, Maryland  20910

301 495 4654
fred.boyd@montgomeryplanning.org
Attachment D
Site Name: Bretton Woods
Wireless Communication Facility
15700 River Road
Germantown, MD 20874

Photograph Information:
View 2 - River Road
View from the Northwest
SITE NOT VISIBLE